

RECEIVED

2003 DEC -5 PM 12:55



BellSouth Telecommunications, Inc.
Suite 2101
333 Commerce Street
Nashville, TN 37201-3300
guy.hicks@bellsouth.com

TRA DOCKET ROOM

Guy M. Hicks
General Counsel

615 214-6301
Fax 615 214-7406

December 5, 2003

VIA HAND DELIVERY

Hon. Deborah Taylor Tate, Chairman
Tennessee Regulatory Authority
460 James Robertson Parkway
Nashville, TN 37238

Re: *BellSouth Telecommunications, Inc.'s Motion to Modify Statement of Generally Available Terms: Amendment to Self-Effectuating Enforcement Mechanism*
Docket No. 03-00597

Dear Chairman Tate:

Enclosed are the original and fourteen copies of BellSouth's *Motion to Place SEEM Payments in Escrow*. Copies of the enclosed are being provided to counsel of record in TRA Docket No. 01-00193 *Performance Measurements*, in which the original motion was filed.

Very truly yours,

A large, stylized handwritten signature in black ink, appearing to be "Guy M. Hicks".

Guy M. Hicks

GMH:ch

BEFORE THE TENNESSEE REGULATORY AUTHORITY
Nashville, Tennessee

In Re: *BellSouth Telecommunications, Inc.'s Motion to Modify Statement of Generally Available Terms: Amendment to Self-Effectuating Enforcement Mechanism*

Docket No. 03-00597

BELLSOUTH'S MOTION TO PLACE SEEM PAYMENTS IN ESCROW

BellSouth Telecommunications, Inc. ("BellSouth"), hereby files its Motion to Place SEEM Payments In Escrow, and states the following:

On October 28, 2003, BellSouth filed its Motion to Modify SEEM Plan, which requested the entry of an Order to remove any penalties from the SEEM Plan relating to the provision of line sharing. No response to the Motion has been filed to date.¹ As stated in BellSouth's Motion, the Federal Communications Commission ("FCC") recently ruled in the Triennial Review Order² that line sharing is no longer an unbundled network element that incumbent LECs are required to offer pursuant to Section 251 of the Act. For this reason, and for the other reasons set forth in BellSouth's Motion, penalties relating to the provisioning of line sharing should immediately be removed from the SEEM Plan.

The FCC's Triennial Review Order became effective on October 2, 2003. Thus, the first month for which penalties relating to line sharing should not be paid

¹ On December 1, 2003, the Authority issued a *Notice* requiring that any comments in response to BellSouth's Motion be filed by December 10, 2003.

² *Report and Order and Order on Remand and Further Notice of Proposed Rulemaking* (FCC-03-36). *In the Matter of Review of the Section 251 Unbundling Obligations of Incumbent Local Exchange Carriers, et al.*, CC Docket No. 01-338, et al., FCC 03-36 (rel. Aug. 21, 2003) ("Triennial Review Order").

is October of 2003. Under the terms of the SEEM Plan, both Tier I and Tier II penalties are paid 45 days after the end of the month in which the performance occurs. Thus, any penalties that would be payable for the month of October 2003 would be due on December 15, 2003. BellSouth stated in its Motion that, in the event that the Authority did not rule on BellSouth's Motion by December 15, 2003, then BellSouth would propose to escrow any SEEM payments that relate to line sharing while awaiting the Authority's ruling on BellSouth's Motion. As of this date, no filings relating to BellSouth's Motion have been made by other parties. BellSouth understands, however, that the Authority may not be able to rule on its Motion prior to December 15, 2003. Therefore, BellSouth hereby formally requests that the Authority enter an Order allowing BellSouth to place in escrow any line sharing penalty payments pending the Authority's ruling on BellSouth's Motion, if this ruling does not occur by December 15, 2003.

If the requested relief is not granted, then BellSouth will be required to pay both Tier I and Tier II penalties on December 15, 2003 that the Authority could well subsequently determine should not be paid. In this event, BellSouth would be placed in the untenable position of having to attempt to recoup penalty payments from a number of CLECs. Thus, under the best case scenario, BellSouth would have the unnecessary administrative burden of making payments to CLECs only to later expend additional efforts to recover these funds. There is, of course, a substantial likelihood that at least some of the CLECs would decline to voluntarily return the penalty payments. If these CLECs do not repay the subject penalties for line sharing, then BellSouth would be unjustly deprived of these payments.

Given the above, the better alternative would be for the Authority to allow BellSouth to place into escrow all penalties attributable to line sharing that would be payable on December 15, 2003, until such time as the Authority rules on BellSouth's Motion to Modify SEEM Plan. If the Authority subsequently rules in BellSouth's favor, then the payments would be returned from escrow to BellSouth. Although BellSouth should prevail in this issue for the reasons set forth in its Motion, if BellSouth does not obtain the requested relief, any payments due would be promptly remitted to the CLECs upon the entry of an Order by the Authority. Therefore, granting BellSouth's Motion, and allowing these funds to be paid into escrow, would not cause harm to any party.

Although the immediate entry of an Order allowing BellSouth to pay the above-described funds into escrow is the best approach, BellSouth also proposes an alternative, i.e., that the Authority allow BellSouth to offset any SEEM payments made for line sharing, which the Authority's subsequently determines are not required, against subsequent penalty payments due under Tier I and Tier II. In other words, if the Authority ultimately rules in BellSouth's favor on the Motion to Modify SEEM Plan, then BellSouth would be allowed to offset all SEEM payments for line sharing, beginning with those due December 15, 2003, against penalties that BellSouth otherwise would owe under the Plan. Thus, if at the time the Authority rules, BellSouth owes penalty payments to a given CLEC, it would simply reduce the amount of the payment by the amount of the line sharing penalties that BellSouth had paid beginning December 15, 2003. Again, BellSouth believes that the better alternative is to enter immediately an Order allowing

BellSouth the authority to place the subject payments into escrow. If the Authority declines to take this action, however, then allowing BellSouth to offset these penalties against others that are due in the future would likely represent the only realistic opportunity that BellSouth would have to recoup these funds.

Finally, there is a possibility that the Authority will not be able to rule on the instant Motion prior to December 15, 2003. This would mean that, even if the Authority ultimately grants BellSouth's Motion to escrow funds, then the payments due on December 15, 2003 (and perhaps even later payments) would be made before the Authority grants BellSouth the right to escrow funds or grants BellSouth relief on the Motion to modify the SEEM Plan. Thus, BellSouth requests that the Authority also Order that, if this occurs, then BellSouth will be allowed to recoup any penalties paid under either Tier I or Tier II prior to the time this motion is granted, by offsetting the amounts paid for line sharing against other payments that are owed by BellSouth under the Plan, as described above.

WHEREFORE, BellSouth respectfully requests the entry of an Order allowing it to escrow all SEEM payments relating to line sharing, beginning with October of 2003 (i.e., for which penalties are payable beginning December 15, 2003), until such time as the Authority has ruled on BellSouth's Motion to Modify SEEM Plan. In the alternative, BellSouth requests that the Authority grant BellSouth the ability to offset any SEEM penalties paid for line sharing that are subsequently determined not to be due (in the event the Authority grants BellSouth's Motion to Modify SEEM Plan) by allowing BellSouth to offset the amount of these Tier I and Tier II line sharing penalties against other Tier I and Tier II penalty payments that are due.

Respectfully submitted,

BELLSOUTH TELECOMMUNICATIONS, INC.



By: _____

Guy M. Hicks

Joelle J. Phillips

333 Commerce Street, Suite 2101

Nashville, TN 37201-3300

615/214-6301

R. Douglas Lackey

J. Phillip Carver

BellSouth Center – Suite 4300

675 West Peachtree Street, N.E.

Atlanta, Georgia 30375

CERTIFICATE OF SERVICE

I hereby certify that on December 5, 2003, a copy of the foregoing document was served on the following parties, via the method indicated:

<input type="checkbox"/> Hand	Martha M. Ross-Bain
<input type="checkbox"/> Mail	AT&T
<input type="checkbox"/> Facsimile	1200 Peachtree Street, Suite 8100
<input type="checkbox"/> Overnight	Atlanta, Georgia 30309
<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Electronic	<u>rossbain@att.com</u>

<input type="checkbox"/> Hand	Henry Walker, Esquire
<input type="checkbox"/> Mail	Boult, Cummings, et al.
<input type="checkbox"/> Facsimile	P. O. Box 198062
<input type="checkbox"/> Overnight	Nashville, TN 37219-8062
<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Electronic	<u>hwalker@boultcummings.com</u>

<input type="checkbox"/> Hand	Jon E. Hastings, Esquire
<input type="checkbox"/> Mail	Boult, Cummings, et al.
<input type="checkbox"/> Facsimile	P. O. Box 198062
<input type="checkbox"/> Overnight	Nashville, TN 37219-8062
<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Electronic	<u>jhastings@boultcummings.com</u>

<input type="checkbox"/> Hand	Charles B. Welch, Esquire
<input type="checkbox"/> Mail	Farris, Mathews, et al.
<input type="checkbox"/> Facsimile	618 Church St., #300
<input type="checkbox"/> Overnight	Nashville, TN 37219
<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Electronic	<u>cwelch@farrismathews.com</u>

<input type="checkbox"/> Hand	Dana Shaffer, Esquire
<input type="checkbox"/> Mail	XO Communications, Inc.
<input type="checkbox"/> Facsimile	105 Malloy Street
<input type="checkbox"/> Overnight	Nashville, TN 37201
<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Electronic	<u>dshaffer@xo.com</u>

A handwritten signature in black ink, appearing to read 'Dana Shaffer', is written over a horizontal line.